

Serial No. **10/021,440**

Docket No. **K-0361**

Amdt. dated January 17, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claims 9, 14 and 19 without disclaimer. Further, Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20 and 21 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-8, 10-13, 15-18 and 20-22 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 21 and 22 have been objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-4 (and apparently claims 10 and 12) have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katou. Claims 5, 6, 8, 13 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katou, in view of Park. Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katou and Park in view of Prasad et al. Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katou and Prasad.

The Examiner indicates that claims 9, 14-17 and 19-22 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 9, 14-17 and 19-22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Serial No. **10/021,440**

Docket No. **K-0361**

Amdt. dated January 17, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

Claim Objections

Claims 21 and 22 have been objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended the claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-4 (and apparently claims 10 and 12) have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katou. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Regarding claim 1, Applicant submits that this claim has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 9, deemed allowable by the Examiner and, therefore, is patentable over the cited reference.

Regarding claims 2-4, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the cited reference does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-4, 10 and 12 of the present application. Applicant respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 5, 6, 8, 13 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katou, in view of Park. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Regarding claims 5, 13 and 18, Applicant submits that these claims have been amended to

Amdt. dated January 17, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

include the subject matter of claim 9, 14 and 19, deemed allowable by the Examiner and, therefore, are patentable over the cited references. Regarding claims 6 and 8, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on independent claim 5 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 5, 6, 8, 13 and 18 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katou and Park in view of Prasad et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that this claim is dependent on independent claim 5 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 7 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katou and Prasad. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that this claim is

Serial No. **10/021,440**

Docket No. **K-0361**

Amdt. dated January 17, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

dependent on independent claim 10 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 11 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-8, 10-13, 15-18 and 20-22 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Serial No. **10/021,440**

Docket No. **K-0361**

Amdt. dated January 17, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg

Date: January 17, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610